

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

> . + .;;

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/475,912	12/30/1999	PERRY A. PIERCE	E-925	7042	
75	590 03/24/2003				
CHARLES R MALANDRA JR			EXAMINER		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	RVIEW DRIVE ZURITA, JAMES H			AMES H	
PO BOX 3000 SHELTON, CT	` 06484		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3625		
			DATE MAIL ED: 03/24/2003	DATE MAIL ED: 03/24/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	1		
•	Application No.	epplicant(s)	Λ.
Advisory Action	09/475,912	PIERCE, PERRY A.	1
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James Zurita	3625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	; ,
THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a th places the application	a in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	ng date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main	ount of the fee. The appropria originally set in the final Office	ate extension e action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplif	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ame	endment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.⊠ The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>09 July 2</u>	<u>2002</u> is a)⊠ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Exa	miner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	/	
10. Other:	Lieffin Prima	rey A. Smith ary Examiner	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (a) request for reconsideration is not persuasive (b)remarks are not conmesurate with the scope of the claims (e.g. negotiate rates not in claims) (c) one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.